UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,277	06/23/2006	Kazunari Kobayashi	292950US0PCT	4084
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			MARKS, JACOB B	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1729	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/24/2012	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/584,277	KOBAYASHI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
JACOB MARKS	1729

	1720				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the corresp	oondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 27 January 2012 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOY	WANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following repl application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR	es: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or oth with appeal fee) in compliance with 37	her evidence, which places the 7 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request			
periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the	o final rejection				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advis no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).	ory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the fin han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.			
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on whave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the short set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on and the corresponding amount of the fee ened statutory period for reply originally set	ee. The appropriate extension fee to the final Office action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complian filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extensio a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with <u>AMENDMENTS</u>	n thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid o	dismissal of the appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but (a) They raise new issues that would require further conside (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better f appeal; and/or	orm for appeal by materially reducing o	or simplifying the issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corr NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sponding number of finally rejected cla	laims.			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	•	t Amendment (PTOL-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).	<u> </u>	-			
7. A For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		tered and an explanation of			
Claim(s) rejected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3 and 17-21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and su was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a N entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over	ome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/o	or appellant fails to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:					
/Ula C. Ruddock/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1729					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues the prior art of record, Hikata et al., does not teach the step of press forming while the temperature is at between 120 and 210 C. Hikata teaches that the alloy is rolled at a temperature of between 180 and 200 C, then extruded. It is unclear what temperature the extrusion occurs, however, it is reasonable to assume that in an assembly line type process the time between rolling and extruding would be short, such that the temperature would not change significantly. In addition, the claim does not specifically recite which part of the process of press-forming occurs at the claimed temperature range, i.e. it could be during a rolling process as in Hikata.

Applicant argues that Hikata et al. does not teach applicants claimed grain diameter distribution between the inner wall and outer wall. Applicant claims the distribution of grain diameter can be between 1.0 and 1.4. However, such a range includes 1.0, which means that the grain sizes are all the same. Such a constant grain diameter would be expected from the process of Hikata et al.